



Rules to safeguard good scientific practice at the Leibniz Institute of Ecological Urban and Regional Development, Dresden

Preamble

The Leibniz Institute of Ecological Urban and Regional Development (IOER) as a whole as well as all persons entrusted with personnel management in the field of scientific research are responsible for ensuring compliance with the principles of good scientific practice as set out in the Guidelines of the Leibniz Association of 27 November 2015 and the Memorandum of the German Research Foundation. The basis of scientific work at the IOER is the honesty of the scientists towards themselves and others. Young scientists are taught the principles of good scientific practice.

Rule 1: Good scientific practice

- (1) The rules of good scientific practice in particular include:
 - (a)
 - to work *lege artis*;
 - to fully document all stages and results of an experiment or study, and securely store the records and primary data;
 - to critically and consistently examine the validity and reproducibility of all experimental results and other research projects;
 - to be stringently honest with regard to the contributions of collaborators as well as towards external funding providers;
 - to observe the intellectual property of others and appropriately highlight all citations and appropriations in all publications;
 - (b) the appropriate supervision of scientists during the creation and academic evaluation of theses/dissertations for the purpose of obtaining a qualification (the framework conditions for scientific careers within the Leibniz Association are the subject of separate guidelines and recommendations);
 - (c) responsible collaboration within working groups and the responsible fulfilment of managerial tasks within these, including the appropriate supervision of the groups' members;
 - (d) the responsibility of authors of scientific publications regarding the content, including the representation of results and their discussion;
 - (e) to always give precedent to originality and quality over quantity as performance and assessment criteria for promotions, appointments, hiring staff and the allocation of funding.
- (2) Scientific publications should describe scientific results and how they were derived in a comprehensive and comprehensible manner. Results and texts published previously can only be made a part of later publications when clearly

identified as such (duplicate publication) and only when absolutely required for the purposes of comprehending the context of the publication.

- (3) Only those who themselves substantially contributed to the design of the study or experiments, to the generation, analysis and interpretation of data and to the formulation of the manuscript, and have agreed to its publication – i.e. assumed responsibility for it – should be named as the authors. A so-called honorary authorship is not permitted. These regulations should form the substance of a collaboration agreement for e.g. major collaborative research projects.
- (4) Primary data must be stored in an accessible format for a minimum of 10 years. Data for which there are central, public repositories should be made accessible to the same.

Rule 2: Scientific misconduct

Scientific misconduct has occurred when deliberate or grossly negligent misrepresentations are made, rights to intellectual property are violated or the research activities of others are impaired.

Alongside violations of scientific ethics, in particular through inhumane or misleading practices, scientific misconduct above all includes the following:

- (1) Misrepresentation – in particular:
 - (a) the fabrication of data;
 - (b) the falsification of data (e.g. by selecting desired results or rejecting unwanted results or evaluation procedures without making this public, or by manipulating figures or diagrams);
 - (c) false information in publications lists or a funding application (including misrepresentations regarding the publishing body and forthcoming publications);
 - (d) multiple publication of data or texts without making this public.
- (2) Violating intellectual property rights – in particular:
 - (a) with regard to a legally protected work created by another party, or to another party's substantial scientific findings, hypotheses, models or research approaches:
 - the unauthorized appropriation or other utilization of passages of text without appropriately crediting the author (plagiarism);
 - the exploitation of research approaches and ideas without consent, in particular as reviewer;
 - the untruthful claim to or unjustified acceptance of scientific authorship or co-authorship, as well as the refusal of a justified co-authorship;
 - the falsification of content or
 - the unauthorized publication of, and provision to third parties of access to, a work, finding, hypothesis, model or research approach that has not yet been lawfully published;
 - (b) claiming the (co-)authorship of another person without their consent.
- (3) Impairing the research activities of others (including damaging, destroying or manipulating research set-ups, devices, documents, hardware, software, chem-

icals or any other materials required by another party for conducting an experiment).

- (4) The destruction of primary data when this represents a violation of legal requirements or recognized principles of scientific work. This also applies for unlawful failure to destroy data (in particular personal data).

Joint responsibility for scientific misconduct can result from participating in the misconduct of others, gross negligence with regard to supervisory duties, or the co-authorship of forged publications.

Rule 3: Organisation

- (1) The Director is responsible for implementing the guidelines at the IOER. All persons of responsibility, in particular the heads of the research areas, must ensure through appropriate organisation of their working areas that the tasks of management, supervision, dispute resolution and quality assurance are clearly assigned and that they are actually performed.
- (2) To resolve questions of scientific misconduct at the IOER, the scientific staff elect one senior female scientist and one senior male scientist to serve as ombudspersons for a period of 4 years. The Director has the right of nomination.
- (3) An ombudsperson shall be elected if s/he receives at least 30 % of the votes of the scientific staff.

Rule 4: General procedure in cases of suspected scientific misconduct

- (1) The procedure for dealing with scientific misconduct in accordance with Rule 5 comes into force if a suspicion or allegation of scientific misconduct arises against a member of the IOER which cannot be clarified through dialogue or by applying the usual instruments of personnel management.
- (2) The suspect shall be given the opportunity to respond to the allegation of misconduct and provide evidence at each stage of the procedure.
- (3) All persons to be heard in the course of the procedure shall be entitled to call in a supporter of their choice.
- (4) An ombudsperson may be rejected due to a concern of bias if there is some reason to indicate a lack of impartiality. The right of petition is granted to the suspect, to the injured party as well as to the investigator of misconduct at any time during the proceedings
- (5) Until evidence of culpable conduct is provided, the names of the parties to the proceedings as well as any findings to date shall be treated in **strict confidence**.
- (6) The identity of the person making the suspicion of scientific misconduct shall not be disclosed to the suspect throughout the proceedings. An exception exists if the suspect is otherwise unable to defend herself/himself properly, in particular because the credibility of the informer is significant to determining misconduct.

- (7) If the suspicion of scientific misconduct falls on the Director of the IOER, the notification of scientific misconduct shall be submitted to the centralised ombudsperson of the Leibniz Association.
- (8) If the suspicion is directed against a person outside the IOER, Rule 6 shall apply.
- (9) All stages of the procedure shall be recorded in a comprehensible manner.

Rule 5: Procedure for suspected scientific misconduct within the IOER

- (1) In the event of concrete suspicions of scientific misconduct, one of the two ombudspersons of the IOER shall be informed in writing.
- (2) The ombudspersons examine the facts of the case at their discretion. If they come to the conclusion that there are sufficient grounds for suspecting scientific misconduct, they shall inform the Director of the IOER.
- (3) The person suspected of misconduct shall be given the opportunity to respond no later than one week after the suspicion has been made and after having been told of the incriminating facts and evidence.
- (4) If the initial suspicion has not been sufficiently confirmed or if misleading behaviour has been sufficiently explained or the dispute amicably settled, the proceedings shall be terminated.
- (5) If the suspicion of misconduct strengthens and the matter cannot be amicably settled, the ombudspersons shall inform the Director. The latter decides on the need for further measures. If necessary, a committee of enquiry may be set up in accordance with Rule 6 of the Guidelines of the Leibniz Association.
- (6) If the allegation is particularly serious, the case may be referred by the ombudspersons of the IOER to the centralised ombudsperson of the Leibniz Association. If this happens, the centralised ombudsperson of the Leibniz Association assumes responsibility for further proceedings.

Rule 6: Procedure for suspected scientific misconduct by persons outside the IOER

- (1) If the allegation of scientific misconduct is directed against a person who are not part of IOER, the ombudspersons of the IOER should be called on to examine the case, in particular in order to support the injured party in evaluating the case and, if necessary, in further steps.
- (2) If the suspicion of scientific misconduct strengthens, the Director of the IOER shall be informed of the matter. The IOER ombudsperson decides whether the accused should be informed directly of the allegation or whether the case should be passed on to a centralised ombudsperson (the Leibniz Association, the DFG).

Rule 7: The consequences of scientific misconduct

Scientific misconduct can have the following consequences depending on the circumstances of the individual case:

- a written reprimand,
- withdrawal of scientific publications,
- details of misconduct passed on to the general public or partner institutions,
- measures under employment law, such as a warning letter or dismissal,
- measures under civil and criminal law, such as the granting of a ban on entering the premises, claims for restitution or damages.

If the proceedings show that the scientific misconduct may result in the revocation of academic qualifications, the misconduct proceedings shall be passed on to the awarding university.

Coming into force

These “Rules to safeguard good scientific practice at the IOER” and procedure for dealing with scientific misconduct come into force with their internal announcement at the institute. They replace the previous rules of 28 June 2002.

Dresden, 24 October 2017

Prof. Dr. Dr. h.c. Bernhard Müller
Director

Remark: This document is the not legally binding English translation of the legally binding German document. Therefore, it is not signed.